

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	Airport Runway Expansion LUL
Proposed Implementation Date:	June 2008
Proponent:	Madison County
Location:	T6S R1E Sec 30
County:	Madison
Trust:	State Industrial School

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

The Big Sky (Ennis) Airport is located on 6 miles south-southeast of Ennis, Montana, in Madison County. The airport is situated on the east side of U.S. Highway 287 at an elevation of 5387 feet above mean sea level. The airport property lies within Sections 30 and 31 of Township 6 South, Range 1 East.

The airport has a paved runway and full parallel taxiway. The paved primary runway is 4,700-feet long by 75-feet wide with a 16-34 orientation. Other paved areas include connecting taxiways at midfield and at each threshold, about 4.6 acres of apron, and a hangar access taxiway.

Runway 16-34 is lighted with radio-controlled, medium-intensity runway lighting (MIRL) systems. The connecting and parallel taxiways have medium-intensity lights. All runway approaches are visual, though a >1-mile GPS-based NPI approach is planned for on the ALP. Runway 16-34 has basic pavement markings. Both runway ends have 2-box PAPI's. The airport's wind cone and segmented circle are just east of midfield, automated weather reporting equipment (Super AWOS) is located within the segmented circle currently operating on 122.8 MHz (a request for a separate frequency has been filed with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), and the airport beacon is west of the apron.

A Non-Directional Beacon (NDB) for VFR-only use is located on airport property immediately west of the ramp. The UNICOM frequency is 122.8 MHz. Several smaller and a large private hangar populate the apron perimeter and access taxiway. 24-hour self-serve 100-octane low lead is provided on the ramp, while Jet A is available by previous arrangement.

The major work items associated with this project include:

- ☐ Reconstruct Runway 16-34 (4,700 x 75');
- ☐ Apply Preventative Pavement Maintenance to Taxiways A, B, and C and both the North and South Aprons;
- ☐ Rehabilitate Runway Lighting;
- ☐ Install Farm Fence;
- ☐ Additive Alternate: Construct 1900' Runway Extension w/ Hammerhead Turnaround (Sponsor Funded); and
- ☐ Additive Alternate: Extend Runway Lighting and Move Runway "16" PAPI

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

Contacted Grazing Lessee Longhorn Ranch, L.P., Tim Gress Manager 406-682-4825, 581-3423 concerned with runoff displacement in old excavatuion

Requested a Species of Concern search using the Montana Natural Heritage Program search program. The report identified the Gray Wolf in the vicinity of this project. This project should have no effect on the wolf due to the current developed nature of the site.

2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

FAA

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Action: license the construction activities on State Land for the expansion of the Airport runway.

No Action: No change in management, Airport expansion not allowed.

III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT
--

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.</i>• <i>Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.</i>• <i>Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.</i> |
|--|

Attachment: Northwest Mountain Region – Airports Division, Environmental Checklist

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.</i>• <i>Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.</i>• <i>Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.</i> |
|--|

Attachment: Northwest Mountain Region – Airports Division, Environmental Checklist

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Action alternative. To issue a Land Use license for the construction activities on State Land for the expansion of the Airport runway.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

No significant impacts.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

☐

EIS

☐

More Detailed EA

☒

No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: Craig Campbell
	Title: Bozeman Unit Manger

Signature: Craig Campbell/s/

Date: 05/20/2008

NORTHWEST MOUNTAIN REGION - AIRPORTS DIVISION

Environmental Checklist

Airport: *Big Sky (Ennis) Airport AIP 3-30-0090-010-2008*

Project Description: *The Big Sky (Ennis) Airport is located on 6 miles south-southeast of Ennis, Montana, in Madison County. The airport is situated on the east side of U.S. Highway 287 at an elevation of 5387 feet above mean sea level. The airport property lies within Sections 30 and 31 of Township 6 South, Range 1 East.*

The airport has a paved runway and full parallel taxiway. The paved primary runway is 4,700-feet long by 75-feet wide with a 16-34 orientation. Other paved areas include connecting taxiways at midfield and at each threshold, about 4.6 acres of apron, and a hangar access taxiway.

Runway 16-34 is lighted with radio-controlled, medium-intensity runway lighting (MIRL) systems. The connecting and parallel taxiways have medium-intensity lights. All runway approaches are visual, though a >1-mile GPS-based NPI approach is planned for on the ALP. Runway 16-34 has basic pavement markings. Both runway ends have 2-box PAPI's. The airport's wind cone and segmented circle are just east of midfield, automated weather reporting equipment (Super AWOS) is located within the segmented circle currently operating on 122.8 MHz (a request for a separate frequency has been filed with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), and the airport beacon is west of the apron.

A Non-Directional Beacon (NDB) for VFR-only use is located on airport property immediately west of the ramp. The UNICOM frequency is 122.8 MHz.

Several smaller and a large private hangar populate the apron perimeter and access taxiway. 24-hour self-serve 100-octane low lead is provided on the ramp, while Jet A is available by previous arrangement.

The major work items associated with this project include:

- Reconstruct Runway 16-34 (4,700 x 75');*
- Apply Preventative Pavement Maintenance to Taxiways A, B, and C and both the North and South Aprons;*
- Rehabilitate Runway Lighting;*
- Install Farm Fence;*
- Additive Alternate: Construct 1900' Runway Extension w/ Hammerhead Turnaround (Sponsor Funded); and*
- Additive Alternate: Extend Runway Lighting and Move Runway "16" PAPI (Sponsor Funded).*

Proposed Start

Date of Project: *Summer 2008*

Purpose & Need: *The purpose of the proposed project is to implement improvements that will ensure the facility safely accommodates the types of aircraft presently using the airport and anticipated future aviation activity.*

Directions: The person preparing this form should have knowledge of the environmental features of the airport and general impacts of the project. Although some responses may be obtained from the preparer's own observations, previous environmental documents or research may be cited. Some of the best sources for information are the jurisdictional federal, state and local resource agencies responsible for the impact categories. When a project involves land that has not previously been disturbed (by construction), the ADO requires a specialist review the categories of cultural resources, wetlands, and threatened and endangered species. Please contact the ADO environmental specialist if you have questions.

FOR EACH YES OR NO ANSWER: PROVIDE DOCUMENTATION USED AS THE BASIS FOR THE DETERMINATION TO PLACE AN "X" IN THE YES OR NO BOXES BELOW, PLACE THE CURSOR OVER THE BOX AND LEFT CLICK YOUR POINTING DEVICE. DO THE SAME TO UNDO A MISTAKEN ENTRY.

CONTROVERSY: Is the proposed project likely to be highly controversial on environmental grounds? ☐ Yes ☒ No

A proposed Federal action is considered highly controversial when the action is opposed on environmental grounds by a Federal, state, or local government agency, or by a substantial number of the persons affected by such action. If the action proponent has any doubt whether a given number of opposing persons is "substantial", or there is a probable risk of litigation, that doubt shall be resolved by discussion with ADO Environmental Specialist to determine if the action should be processed as a highly controversial one.

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable.

All proposed improvements would occur on existing airport property or on lands under perpetual easement for airport use. The project was previously evaluated in an Environmental Assessment (EA) and the FAA issued a FONSI based on the evaluation contained in the EA.

NOISE:

1. Does the project cause the forecast of operations to exceed 90,000 annual adjusted propeller operations or 700 annual adjusted jet operations? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If no, move on to 2. below.

If yes, have noise contours been prepared? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If no, prepare noise contours.

Does the project increase noise exposure levels 1.5 DNL or more over noise sensitive areas (residential homes, schools, health facilities, churches, cultural or historic sites) within the 65 DNL contour? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If no, move on to 2. below.

If yes, can mitigation be committed to to reduce the increase to below the 1.5 DNL threshold of significance? If yes, move on to 2. below. ☐ Yes ☐ No

If no, and mitigation cannot be developed to reduce the impact below the 1.5 DNL threshold, an Environmental Impact Statement will need to be prepared.

2. Does the project cause an increase or change (from existing conditions) in the number and type of aircraft operations and flight paths that would fly over a National Park Service unit (s) or other 49 U.S.C. Section 303 (c) type properties? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If no, then move on to **COMPATIBLE LAND USE**.

If yes, contact the ADO for further directions.

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable. (e.g. ALP, Master Plan, noise contours)

The proposed landside improvement may ultimately result in minor increases in aircraft operations; however, the number of annual aircraft operations would not be at a level sufficient to exceed 90,000 annual adjusted propeller operations or 700 annual adjusted jet operations.

**COMPATIBLE
LAND USE:**

Is the proposed project reasonably consistent with plans, goals, policies, or controls that have been adopted for the area in which the airport is located?

☒ Yes ☐ No

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable. (e.g. Master Plan, zoning ordinance, letters from local jurisdictions)

The proposed project is consistent with planned airport development shown on the ALP which has been in place since the airport was planned/developed in 1986. Additionally, Madison County has been working toward establishing an airport affected area and associated ordinance that regulates land uses and building height in the vicinity of the airport.

SOCIAL IMPACT:

Are residents or businesses being relocated?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, how will those being relocated be accommodated?

Does the project alter surface transportation patterns or cause a degradation of level of service?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, what mitigation is planned?

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable.

The proposed project is consistent with planned airport development shown on the ALP.

**INDUCED
SOCIO-ECONOMIC
IMPACTS:**

Will the project result in disruption of community? (e.g. change in business and economic activity, impact to public service demands)

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, what mitigation is planned?

Are secondary induced impacts (such as changes in population pattern or growth, public service demands, or economic activity expected?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, what mitigation is planned?

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable.

The proposed project is consistent with planned airport development shown on the ALP.

**ENVIRONMENTAL
JUSTICE**

Will the project cause disproportionately high adverse impacts on minority or low-income populations within the DNL 65 contour?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, what mitigation is planned?

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis. (e.g. census data, local statistics)

The project occurs on the existing airport property and there are no residences within the property. The proposed project would not affect any other residents of lands near the airport as the lateral extents of the 65 DNL contour are within the property.

**AIR
QUALITY:**

1. Will the proposed project have the potential to increase landside or airside capacity, including the capacity to handle additional surface vehicles? If no, move on to **WATER QUALITY**. If yes, proceed to question 2 in this topic. ☒ Yes ☐ No
2. Is the proposed project within or adjacent to a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, defined NON-ATTAINMENT (or maintenance) AREA? If no, go to 3. below. ☐ Yes ☒ No
 - a) If yes to 2 above, is the project exempt from the General Conformity regulations published in the Federal Register of November 30, 1993? If yes, go to 3. below. ☐ Yes ☐ No
 - b) If no to 2a, is the project accounted for in the State Implementation Plan? If yes, no further study is necessary. Move on to **WATER QUALITY**. ☐ Yes ☐ No
 - c) If no to 2b, an air pollutant emission inventory must be prepared to determine if the project will produce, on an annual basis, criteria pollutants exceeding the de minimis levels. This inventory analysis should include project revisions, intended to reduce the emission inventory to below de minimus levels. If project emissions cannot be kept below de minimus levels an environmental assessment must be prepared which must also address item 3. below.
3. Are there any "hot spot" surface intersections where the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) might be exceeded as a result of implementing the proposed project? This is usually an intersection that suffers a reduction in the Level of Service (LOS) of two levels resulting in an LOS of less than LOS C. ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes to 3, an intersection air quality analysis must be prepared including an analysis of how planned mitigation will reduce the project concentrations to below the NAAQS. If pollutant concentrations cannot be kept at or below the NAAQS an environmental assessment must be prepared.

If no to 3, no further study is necessary. Move on to **WATER QUALITY**.

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable.

EPA-designated non-attainment areas listings and maps for Montana were reviewed. The project area does not lie within a non-attainment area for any of the criteria pollutants listed by the EPA or the Montana Department of Environmental Quality.

The contractor will be required to obtain necessary permits and comply with federal, state, and local laws/regulations regarding pollution of the environment during the construction of the proposed project.

WATER
QUALITY

Will the proposed project produce water quality impacts to ground water, surface water bodies, public water supply systems, etc?
If yes, what mitigation is planned?

☐ Yes ☒ No

The proposed project will not cause substantial degradation of water quality from direct discharges into surface water or infiltration into ground water.

The ephemeral drainages affected by the project are currently being reviewed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to determine whether these are jurisdictional "Waters of the U.S." The Corps was asked to concur that these affected water courses are not jurisdictional. The agency's jurisdictional call will ultimately determine the need for a Section 404 permit for this project.

The development activities involve more than 1 acre of clearing, grading or excavation, so it is subject to the general Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity for the MDEQ Permitting and Compliance Division. This permit requires that preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) specifying best management practices to control erosion and restrict the transport of sediments to receiving waters. The MDEQ requires the Contractor to submit a complete Notice of Intent (NOI) package prior to beginning construction. If the NOI package is acceptable, the MDEQ will issue a confirmation letter indicating coverage by the General Permit allowing construction to be initiated. Implementation of erosion control measures would ensure that the water quality in the area is protected.

The contractor will be required to obtain necessary permits and comply with federal, state, and local laws/regulations regarding pollution of the environment during the construction of the proposed project.

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable. (e.g. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, water quality certification)

The Big Sky (Ennis) Airport is located on the Cedar Creek alluvial fan on the west slope of the Madison Range. Several intermittent drainages of the Madison River, including Shell, McDeed, and Boulder Creeks, cross lands in the vicinity of the airport.

SECTION 4 (f)
[49 U.S.C. 303 (c)]
IMPACTS:

Will the proposed project impact 49 U.S.C. Section 303 (c) [formerly designated DOT Section 4 (f)] resources (publicly owned land from a public park, recreation area, or wildlife or waterfowl refuge of national, state or local significance, or land of an historic site of national, state or local significance)?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, explain how such impacts will be mitigated. If the impacts cannot be mitigated, 4f applies and an environmental assessment must be prepared.

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable:

An Environmental Assessment (including a Cultural Resource Survey) was conducted to identify the impacts of extending the current runway and taxiway. A Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI) was rendered on 11/01/1999.

CULTURAL
RESOURCES

For proposed projects that involve new disturbed ground (ground that has never been dug up or modified in any way) or off airport increases in noise, the following apply, otherwise, move on to **BIOTIC COMMUNITIES**.

After consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), does the SHPO believe that:

- a) significant architectural, prehistoric, historic, archeological, or paleontological resources may be lost or destroyed as a result of the project. ☐ Yes ☒ No

If no, then move on to b) below.

If yes, then coordinate with the ADO environmental specialist and the SHPO to conduct an appropriate field survey. Send the survey to the ADO environmental specialist for further consideration. Did the survey find significant architectural, prehistoric, historic, archeological, or paleontological resources that would be lost or destroyed as a result of the project? If yes, Section 4f (303) will apply, and an environmental assessment must be prepared. If no, then move on to b) below. ☐ Yes ☐ No

- b) there is Native American tribal interest in the project. ☐ Yes ☒ No

If no, then move on to c).

If yes, notify the ADO environmental specialist of the tribes involved. It is the ADO environmental specialist's responsibility to contact the tribal representative regarding project details.

Does the tribe(s) object to the project or suggest some form of mitigation to alleviate their concerns? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Have those mitigation measures been incorporated into the project to reduce or eliminate those concerns? ☐ Yes ☐ No

- c) the proposed project would impact properties in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If no, then move on to d).

If yes, coordinate with the ADO environmental specialist and the SHPO to conduct an appropriate field survey. Send the survey to the ADO environmental specialist for further consideration.

Did the survey find that properties in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places would be impacted as a result of the project? If yes, Section 4f (303) will apply, and an environmental assessment must be prepared. ☐ Yes ☐ No

If no, then move on to d.), below.

- d) Off airport noise impacts related to a), b), and c) above should be explained under **NOISE**.

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable. (e.g. survey results, letters from SHPO)

An Environmental Assessment (including a Cultural Resource Survey) was conducted to identify the impacts of extending the current runway and taxiway. A Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI) was rendered on 11/01/1999.

**BIOTIC
COMMUNITIES**

Will the proposed project impact plant communities and/or cause the displacement of wildlife? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, explain how such impacts will be accommodated.

On what basis was the determination made? Available documentation to support analysis if applicable (e.g. letters from state/federal agencies)

An Environmental Assessment was conducted to identify the impacts of extending the current runway and taxiway. A Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI) was rendered on 11/01/1999.

**ENDANGERED
AND THREATENED
SPECIES**

1. Does the proposed project have the potential to impact federal and state listed endangered or threatened species or their habitat? ☐ Yes ☒ No

2. Has the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or National Marine Fishery Service (NMFS) been contacted to acquire lists of endangered or threatened species that may be impacted by the project? ☒ Yes ☐ No
If, no, then contact the services to get the lists, if any.

The USFWS online summary of listed species (accessed via the Montana Ecological Field Offices website on March 10, 2008) shows the following species occur in Madison County:

- ***Ute Ladies' Tresses (*Spiranthes diluvialis*) – Threatened***
- ***Gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) – Delisted effective March 28, 2008***
- ***Canada lynx (*Lynx Canadensis*) – Threatened***

3. Are there listed species in the area? ☐ Yes ☒ No

4. Are the critical habitats of listed species adversely impacted? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes to either 3. or 4., then a biological assessment must be prepared. An environmental assessment may also need to be prepared.

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable:

According to the Rangewide Status Review of Ute Ladies' Tresses (prepared for the USFWS and Central Utah Water Conservancy District by Walter Fertig, Rick Black, and Paige Wolken, September 30, 2005, there are no known occurrences of Ute Ladies' Tresses in the immediate area of the Big Sky (Ennis) Airport. Additionally, occurrence information for this species obtained from the Montana Natural Heritage Program showed no occurrences of Ute Ladies' Tresses in the area.

On February 28, 2008, the USFWS issued a proposal to revise the amount of critical habitat designated for the Canada lynx. Madison County is not within the proposed critical habitat and the airport property does not contain any mesic coniferous forest habitat favored by lynx.

**ESSENTIAL FISH
HABITAT (EFH)**

Does the proposed project have the potential to impact fish habitat protected under the Magnuson-Stevens act (ID, OR, WA)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, has an Essential Fish Habitat assessment been prepared and consulted upon with the National Marine Fisheries Service? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Are the habitats of listed species adversely impacted? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, what conservation measures must be incorporated into the project design?

On what basis was the determination made? Reference Available documentation to support analysis if applicable:

Not Applicable.

MIGRATORY BIRD ACT Does the proposed project have the potential to adversely impact birds protected by the migratory bird treaty act? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, are the habitats of listed species adversely impacted? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, what conservation measures have been incorporated into the project design?

On what basis was the determination made? Reference Available documentation to support analysis if applicable:

An Environmental Assessment was conducted to identify the impacts of extending the current runway and taxiway did not identify any concerns regarding birds and their habitat.

WETLANDS Will the proposed project impact wetlands (traditional [meaning wet ground] or desert washes, clay pans, and playas)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

a) If no, then move on to **FLOODPLAINS**.

If yes, move on to b).

b) Has the proposed project area been surveyed for wetlands as described above? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If no to b), a wetland delineation study must be done in consultation with the ADO and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

If yes to b., has the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) concurred on the wetland delineation? Explain how such impacts will be mitigated. ☐ Yes ☐ No

On what basis was the determination made? Reference Available documentation to support analysis if applicable: (e.g. 404 permit, consultation with the Corps, wetland delineation report and Corps verification report)

The National Wetland Inventory (NWI), maintained by the USFWS, provides planning information about wetland sites in many areas of the U.S. Digital NWI maps showing riverine and palustrine wetland sites area available for many areas of Montana. However, NWI mapping is not available for this portion of Madison County.

The USDA Natural Resources and Conservation Service (NRCS) has completed soils mapping available for the general area surrounding the airport and has identified hydric soils. Hydric soils, one of the primary indicators of wetlands, are those that are saturated, flooded, or ponded long enough during the growing season to develop anaerobic conditions that favor the growth of hydrophytic vegetation (i.e. plants adapted to saturated soils, such as cattails). Hydric soils may also be within floodplains and riparian habitats. The NRCS mapping shows that none of the soils in the vicinity of the airport are considered to be hydric soils.

The ephemeral drainages affected by the project are currently being reviewed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to determine whether these are jurisdictional "Waters of the U.S." The Corps was asked to concur that these affected water courses are not jurisdictional. The agency's decision on this matter will determine the need for a Section 404 permit.

FLOODPLAINS Will the proposed project impact floodplains? ☐ Yes ☒ No

On what basis was the determination made? Reference Available documentation to support analysis if applicable: (e.g. 404 permit, consultation with the Corps, floodplain delineation report)

Four drainage channels cross the airport property. However, there are no Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated 100-year floodplains associated with any of these drainages.

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM Is the proposed project consistent with the approved state Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program Plan? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If no, then the project sponsor and FAA will need to consult with the state and Federal CZM offices and document the outcome in an environmental assessment.

On what basis was the determination made? Reference Available documentation to support analysis if applicable: (e.g. state CZM plan)

Not Applicable.

COASTAL BARRIERS DO NOT APPLY TO THE NORTHWEST MOUNTAIN REGION

WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS Would the proposed project affect any portion of the free-flowing characteristics of a Wild and Scenic River or a Study River, or any adjacent areas that are part of such rivers, listed on the Wild and Scenic Rivers Inventory? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, explain how such impacts will be mitigated.

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable:

There are no designated Wild and Scenic Rivers in the Ennis area.

FARMLANDS Will the proposed project impact prime or unique farmlands? Has the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) been contacted to determine if the proposed project will impact prime or unique farmlands? ☐ Yes ☒ No

The NRCS's NCSS Web Soil Survey (interactive soils mapping Internet website) was consulted to identify soil types on affected airport lands and to determine if any soils on the property are designated as prime and unique farmlands.

If there are prime or unique farmlands impacted, has the Farmland Protection Policy Act form AD-1006 process be completed and project adjustments been made the preferred alternative, if necessary?

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable: (e.g. Farmland Impact Rating Form)

Three soils in the project area (11 – Attewan loam, 12 – Attewan Cobbly loam, and Trimad cobbly loam) are designated as farmland of statewide importance or farmland of local importance. However, these soils lie within existing airport property on lands that have already been planned for future airport development activities. Therefore, there is no need to proceed with the Farmland Protection Policy Act form AD-1006 process if the proposed airport activities occur within airport property as determined in the EA and associated FONSI dated 11/01/1999.

ENERGY SUPPLY AND NATURAL RESOURCES	Will the proposed project impact energy supply of natural resources in a detrimental manner?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
---	--	---

If YES, explain how such impacts will be mitigated.

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable:

None of the materials to be used for the proposed project are in short supply. A ready supply of energy exists to power equipment needed to construct the project.

LIGHT EMISSIONS	Will the proposed project produce light emission impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
-----------------	---	---

If YES, how will such impacts be mitigated?

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable:

The base bid proposed improvements would not change light emissions from equipment or facilities at the airport. However, if the runway is constructed, the associated runway edge lighting would also be extended. This improvement would add approximately 20 medium intensity runway lights.

SOLID WASTE IMPACT	Will the proposed project produce solid waste impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
-----------------------	--	---

If YES, how will such impacts be mitigated?

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable:

There are no landfill or disposal sites near the airport that might create a hazard to aircraft due to birds or animals. No open dump or solid waste collection areas would be allowed on the airport property.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS	Will the proposed project produce construction impacts, such as increases in localized noise levels, reduce localized air quality, produce erosion or pollutant runoff, or disrupt local traffic patterns?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
-------------------------	--	---

Temporary increases in noise levels due to the operation of construction equipment. Temporary and minor impacts on air quality due to vehicle emissions from construction equipment and generation of particulates (dust) from the operation of heavy equipment and paving. Increased traffic volumes on airport access roads and other routes due to workers and equipment traveling to and from the airport sites. The generation of minor amounts of waste products from construction activities on the site would also occur.

If YES, explain how such impacts will be mitigated?

The provisions of FAA Advisory Circular 150/5370-10, Standards for Specifying Construction of Airports, (change 10), Item P-156, Temporary Air and Water Pollution, Soil Erosion, and Siltation Control, would be incorporated into the project specifications. Other FAA guidance concerning airport drainage, environmental enhancement, and construction controls would be evaluated for provisions that may be incorporated into the contract specifications to minimize the potential impacts of construction activities.

Development activities involving more than 1 acre of clearing, grading or excavation, are subject to the general Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity for the MDEQ Permitting and Compliance Division. This permit requires that preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) specifying best management practices to control erosion and restrict the transport of sediments to receiving waters. The MDEQ requires the Contractor to submit a complete Notice of Intent (NOI) package prior to beginning construction. If the NOI package is acceptable, the MDEQ will issue a confirmation letter indicating coverage by the General Permit allowing construction to be initiated. Implementation of erosion control measures would ensure that the water quality in the area is protected.

An air quality permit will be required from the MDEQ for gravel crushing operations. Additionally, MDEQ advises that an Open Cut mining permit is needed if gravel or large amounts of borrow are to be obtained on-site. At this time, the source of gravel to be used for the proposed work is unknown and there is no plan to obtain gravel from lands on the airport property. The proposed work would likely require obtaining large amounts of borrow material from the airport property.

The contractor will be required to obtain necessary permits and comply with federal, state, and local laws/regulations regarding pollution of the environment during the construction of the proposed project.

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable:

**HAZARDOUS
MATERIALS**

Is there reason to believe the proposed project will be constructed in an area that contains hazardous materials? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, explain how such impacts will be mitigated.

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable:

An Environmental Assessment was conducted to identify the impacts of extending the current runway and taxiway. No hazardous materials were identified within airport property. A Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI) was rendered on 11/01/1999.

**CUMULATIVE
IMPACTS**

When considered together with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development projects on or off the airport, federal or non-federal, would the proposed project produce a significant cumulative effect on any of the environmental impact categories above?

SEE ATTACHMENT #1 TO THIS CHECKLIST FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS RELATED TO THIS TOPIC.

On what basis was the determination made? Reference available documentation to support analysis if applicable:

The EA and FONSI signed on 11/01/1999 concluded the proposed airport development activities would not result in any significant cumulative effects.

###

Preparer Certification

I certify that the information I have provided above is, to the best of my knowledge, correct.

Signature

Date

Name, Title

Phone

Affiliation

Airport Sponsor Certification

I certify that the information I have provided above is, to the best of my knowledge, correct. I also recognize and agree that no construction activity, including but not limited to site preparation, demolition, or land disturbance, shall proceed for the above proposed project(s) until FAA issues a final environmental decision for the proposed project (s) and until compliance with all other applicable FAA approval actions (e.g., ALP approval, airspace approval, grant approval) has occurred.

Signature

Date

FAA Decision:

Having reviewed the above information, certified by the responsible airport official, it is the FAA's decision that the proposed project (s) or development warrants environmental processing as indicated below.

- ☐ The proposed project has been found to qualify for a Categorical Exclusion as provided by FAA Order 5050.4A, airport Environmental Handbook, Chapter 3, paragraph 23.
- ☐ The proposed project exhibits conditions that require the preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) (List subject areas e.g. noise, water quality, threatened and endangered species etc.)
- ☐ The following additional documentation is necessary for FAA to perform a complete environmental evaluation of the proposed project

Project Reviewed and Recommended by:

FAA Environmental Specialist

Date

Approved:

FAA Approving Official
Form Date: APRIL 1, 2004

Date

Attachment #1 to ANM Environmental Checklist

26. CUMULATIVE IMPACT. (FROM FAA ORDER 5050.4A) and amended by the St. George, Utah, Washington, D. C. Circuit Court Decision of May 24, 2002

a. In determining whether an [environmental assessment (EA), ANM addition] environmental impact statement (EIS) is required for a proposed Federal action, it is necessary to consider the overall cumulative impact of the proposed action and the consequences of subsequent related actions. CEQ 1508.7 states that "'Cumulative impact' is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time."

b. CEQ 1508.25 defines three types of actions to be considered in determining the scope of an [EA] or EIS: "(a) Actions (other than unconnected single actions) which may be:

(1) Connected actions, which means that they are closely related and therefore should be discussed in the same [assessment] or impact statement. Actions are connected if they: (i) Automatically trigger other actions which may require [assessments] or environmental impact statements, (ii) Cannot or will not proceed unless other actions are taken previously or simultaneously, and (iii) Are interdependent parts of a larger action and depend on the larger action for their justification.

(2) Cumulative actions, which when viewed with other proposed actions have cumulatively significant impacts and should therefore be discussed in the same impact statement.

(3) Similar actions, which when viewed with other reasonably foreseeable or proposed agency actions, have similarities that provide a basis for evaluating their environmental consequences (sic) together, such as common timing or geography. An agency may wish to analyze these actions in the same [assessment] or impact statement. It should do so when the best way to assess adequately the combined impacts of similar actions or reasonable alternatives to such actions is to treat them in a single impact statement."

c. For airport actions, the effect of a number of decisions about a complex of projects can be individually limited to the extent that a finding of no significant impact or categorical exclusion would appear to be appropriate for each project; however, when considered together, the projects may exceed the threshold values in paragraph 47e. In both environmental assessments and environmental impact statements, the total proposal must be considered. In the context of the CEQ Regulations, the total proposal includes the proposed action and all other actions reasonably related to it in time and probability.

The following are some examples:

(1) Land acquisition and a future runway extension.

(2) Runway extension and road relocation, when the road needs to be moved to accommodate the extension.

(3) Grading for an Instrument Landing System (ILS) and future installation of the ILS.

(4) Apron work for terminal area relocation which necessitates highway rerouting, which in turn involves housing relocation. Terminal area relocation is the principal action justifying the project, but the effect on community disruption or other impacts due to the highway or housing relocation must be included in assessing the total proposal.

(5) An initial runway extension and a second phase extension which is part of a firm development program or reasonably foreseeable in the near future.

d. In determining when to consider the effects of actions by other agencies in the airport vicinity, the potential for combined significant impact shall be evaluated. For example, new highway construction and airport expansion in combination may create significant air quality impacts. Extensive earth moving from more than one project may combine to cause severe erosion or flooding.

e. For further detail on the treatment of present and related future actions, see Chapter 10 of FAA Order 5050.4A.